

SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Claim 1 is amended in accordance with suggestions made by the Examiner in order to provide better support for the specific limitations set forth therein.

Claim 15 is amended to provide proper support.

Claims 16-23 are cancelled without prejudice to the subject matter therein. They are cancelled in order to reduce the issues.

The amendments are believed strictly editorial in nature, entirely consistent with and supported by the specification as originally filed, and it is believed there is no possibility of new matter.

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are in the case.

Applicants first want to thank Examiner Witherspoon for the courteous and helpful discussion on 26 February 2008 with Applicant's representative.

During the discussion, it was first pointed out by Applicant's representative that the present application entered the U.S. from the PCT. Claims were amended during the PCT stage. Claims reflecting the "current" status were received in the mail room of the USPTO on September 1, 2006; as reflected in the Public PAIR system. This proper set of claims renders many of the objections/rejections moot, e.g., "use" claims and multiple claim dependencies.

It is these September 1, 2006, claims that form the basis of the amended claims of the present response.

It is believed agreement was reached on this issue during the aforementioned discussion. Additional claim amendments requested by the Examiner have been made.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objections to the claims and the rejection under 35 USC §101 and §112 be withdrawn.

Also during the discussion on 26 February 2008, the Vora et al. reference (U.S. 5,714,662) and Bahrmann et al. reference (U.S. 5,808,168) were discussed and the present claims distinguished therefrom.

To quote from the present specification:

[0018] It is important in this invention, that the propylene containing fraction be separated from the olefin product of the oxygenate to olefins reaction so as to contain a major amount of propylene and a lesser amount of ethylene and/or butenes. This type of separation, which can be accomplished using conventional means, will tend to concentrate dimethyl ether, which is likely to be present in the olefin product of the oxygenate to olefin process, in the propylene/propane fraction.

and further:

[0026] We have found that when such a separated propylene containing stream is used as a feed to a hydroformylation process which uses a rhodium catalyst, particularly a low pressure rhodium process, the dimethyl ether will not significantly affect the catalytic activity of the catalyst and the use of this propylene composition overcomes the traditional need to remove dimethyl ether from such materials.

In contrast, Vora et al. does not pass a separated propylene stream to hydroformylation, as claimed in the present invention. Rather, the reference teaches converting separated propylene to DIPE. See col. 13, about line 50, over to col. 14, line 7.

Bahrman et al. does not cure the deficiencies of Vora et al., and we believe the Examiner did not intend to cite Bahrman et al. for that proposition. According to the Official Action, the reference was cited for its relevance to hydroformylation, not separation of a propylene stream from an olefin stream.

Accordingly, a combination of the references does not fairly suggest the present invention.

For these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

There being no further issues, it is believed that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

April 18, 2008
Date

/Andrew B. Griffis/
Andrew B. Griffis
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,336

Post Office Address (to which all correspondence should be sent):
ExxonMobil Chemical Co.
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
Phone: 281-834-1886
Fax: 281-834-2495